ARCHITECTURE BETTER THAN "NAVVY WORK."

TOWN HALL, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD.

Mister Bilder,—If so be I am not makin to bould, for I like to be at top on t tree—tho Bill Sykes t Bricklayr see he thowt I ud be offenden ye, hud Ise beerd a diffrent tail, not that, so to cum at point. I send in your paper on t 15th on this munth a advertisment cald competitons to architeks, Builders, and Others. This I thowt wor kindly ment, so as I nowd that mony girt Ingeneers had worked in Coil pits or at pudlin furness, and sum like John Car o York in stein pits and quarrys, and that brindly wor nowt bud a navvy lik mesen, and I can chalk out scratches as weel as sum o yawr carpenter lads, it south as Ise seed, I tuk it upon me to indite a letter to they chaps at Hemel Hemstead, and when I wrote it Bill see nay, thous dun it so weel that thou mun send t copy out; an its ony to shew thous gettin a bit o pluck in thee. So here it is, and happen ye'll approve on it.

Coppy.

Mister Roberts, Lord Mayor of Hemel Hamstead, Sir,

I seed a kindly advertisment to architect, bilders, and others in t' Bilder paper of Setterday last when I wor up in London to see t girt glas house, and as I am one ot tothers, I tak liberty of asking you for the further partiklers, as I got a notion that I can make plans for t new town hall as is to be stuk upon collums or piers if yel be so good as send me t sise on them piers, and say wether ye wad like town hall to be of stein or brik or wood or lats and compo, and I sal be sewer and send in time, becoss the chanse of making more nor fifteen shillin a week on t railways, costes nowt but a bit of labour for a chap out of work, as a friend that I teld on my skeme has gid me t paper and pencil. Direct for me by t name of Jonas Warton, at Matty Grogans, friday market, York. I thowt Ide just send summat ot sort to Mr. George Piggott, Esq., of Bolton, but Ile just bide a bit till Ise done this, and then for t church edicationals.

PATENT RIGHTS AND LAW FOR PATENTEES.

A case was set down for trial on Tuesday, the 11th inst., in the Common Pleas, and as it involves some matter that may prove important to inventors,—being, moreover, in the *building* line,—I send you the fullest report that has appeared.

Denley v. Blore.

This was an action by the plaintiff, a builder at Pimlico, and a patentee of an invention for the construction of tubular flues for chimneys, against the defendant, who is the well known architect, for an infringement of his patent. The defendant pleaded not guilty.

In 1842 the plaintiff took out a patent for the application of tubular pipes, composed of baked terra cotta, or potter's clay, to chimneys, by means of which, and the mode in which they were to be fixed in buildings, air was excluded from the chimney, heat and flame confined to it, and the whole mass of the building was considerably strengthened. When the defendant commenced the recent alterations at Buckingham-palace the plaintiff sent a specimen of his invention to the defendant, hoping that he would adopt it at the palace—or, as the learned counsel termed it,—"that splendid building, got up with more than Aladdin-like alacrity," at Pimlico! but upon making inquiries some time afterwards he found, to his surprise, that an exact imitation of his patent was being used there, without his permission, and without his deriving any profit from it. The plaintiff remonstrated, but without effect, and he therefore commenced the present action.

Before the case had proceeded far,

The Lord Chief Justice said—Have you not got the wrong defendant here? Should you not sue the contractor instead of the architect? If I employ an architect, and in his specification he says he will supply me with patent chimneys, does that make him liable if the contractor infringe a patent?

Mr. Serjeant Allen.—Not if he be merely an architect, and do not authorize, or approve of, or benefit by the infringement.

The Lord Chief Justice.—Well, what is the case here, Brother Byles?

Mr. Serjeant Byles.—My lord, the defendant in this case is the architect merely; and whether this patent have been infringed or not,—which is a question,—has had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. Serjeant Allen.—I was afraid it would turn out to be so, my lord. We will, therefore, withdraw for the present, and come again, if advised to do so, against the right party.

Plaintiff non-suited.

It appears that the patentee had his tubular flues (in terra cotta) manufactured at Burslem, and that he opened a wharf for the sale thereof in 1843, which sale he continued for two years, until finding that sale unremunerative, he closed that establishment. He had, however, sold some quantities to various builders, and amongst others to Messrs. Bird, of Hammersmith, who used them in the Consumption Hospital, and also some (chiefly as samples) to Mr. Harrison, who had them taken to Buckingham Palace, in the old portion of which building he used a small quantity.

In the year 1848, the patentee found that his flues had come into general use, and that the whole new additions to Buckingham Palace were fitted up with his plan of chimney-flue: when he applied to the architect of that building, as well as to those of other large edifices in London, for compensation in the shape of license fees, that demand was resisted, and he therefore instituted an action at law *first* against the royal architect.

A postponement of that trial was applied for on the ground that the defendant's principal witness was dangerously ill, and such application was allowed by the Court; therefore the case was deferred until Tuesday last, and when the plaintiff (a poor working bricklayer) came forward with about nineteen witnesses to support his rights, a new form of delay (or in this instance of defeat) was resorted to, which, if it were known to the defendant on the former postponement, would seem to have been an equally valid reply to the action then as now.

In fact, it was agreed that the defendant in this cause was the wrong man, and that the right man was the *builder*, and not the architect, of Buckingham Palace!

So it was ruled by the Court, and counsel for the plaintiff had no alternative but to withdraw the record, and the unfortunate patentee no other resort but to commence *de novo* against the builder, as he could not very loyally sue her Majesty, hose Royal sign manual was inscribed on his patent, for an infringement of that document.

Thus, having lost seven years (one-half) of his privilege, the brevetted inventor has to enter a new suit, wait three months longer, collect, if he can, his score of witnesses, get up the funds, and keep up his spirits, on the hope of bringing his cause before a jury, under the possible contingency that he may acquire some reward for his ingenuity, and some return for 157*l.* the expense paid on taking out his Royal License!

The wasting anxieties of delay, with the necessity of litigating a patent right, are trying enough to the spirit of a man in competency, but the expenses of repeated law-suits on a poor man are hard to bear. And now, whilst sympathizing societies are struggling to enfranchise poor inventors from extra extortion, it would be well if they would take a hint from this case, and try to establish the validity in evidence of the *original patent*, the *original specification*, and the *original drawings* (as before exorbitantly paid for), in order that there should be *primary* evidence on trials in court.

In the case of *Denley* v. *Blore*, although these documents bore the attesting signatures of officials, they were not admissible as evidence; and although the plaintiff *had them in possession*, he was obliged to pay 3*l.* odd shillings for *new* and *other* copies in order to produce in Court!

If claims of this kind be surreptitious, they ought to be met in a *straightforward* way; but if they be valid, and fair letters patent be worth anything, then they ought to be admitted. Q.

The Exchange at Antwerp is about to be covered with a roof of iron and glass.

The Army and Navy Club, Pall-mall, has been opened for the use of the members.

DESIGN FOR ENLARGING SMITHFIELD MARKET.

The Markets' Improvement Committee of the Corporation of London have issued a very good isometrical view, ground plan, and elevation of the improvements in the neighbourhood of Smithfield, designed by Mr. Bunning, and proposed to be carried out by the Corporation. The proposition is to clear a large site to the west of the old market, with a frontage in Victoria-street (the new continuation of Farringdon-street), and to form thereon the dead-meat market next the street, and the cattle-markets behind. On the site of the old markets Mr. Bunning proposes to erect a large establishment of baths and washhouses, a handsome fountain for the use of the market (the lower basin supported by sculptured ox metal bulls), and a pile of lodging-houses for the poor. These last would be in Long-lane, and, if we understand the plan correctly, would be somewhat hemmed in by other buildings.

The plan would have the effect of sweeping away a neighbourhood at present a great nuisance, and would give accommodation for 5,000 beasts and 36,000 sheep, instead of, as now, 2,750 of the first and 30,000 of the latter. Fine as the intention is, however, and great as the improvement upon the present arrangement would be, we should deplore the success of the scheme as tending to perpetuate, in the heart of the City, this mighty nuisance. A traffic of seven millions per annum necessarily involves the interests of a large number of persons, and the removal of it must be dealt with liberally and cautiously: but, apart from this, there is nothing to be advanced in support of the retention of the live-meat market there: the enormous cost of such a scheme in such a place, the insufficiency of the thoroughfares, the demoralising influence of a cattle market, and the long train of other evils which follow, all arm themselves against the endeavour to retain and increase Smithfield-market.

WATER IN DERBY.—CONSTANT SUPPLY.

With reference to a recent note in our provincial news as to the charge for water to the poor by the Derby Waterworks Company, Mr. Hawksley, the engineer, writes us, that the humbler classes are supplied by this company (whose works have only been six weeks in operation) at rates of charge very much less than we were informed was the case. He says the company's scale of charges is as follows:—

When the annual rent amounts to		And does not amount to		s.	d.	
£2	....	£3	....	0	9	per qr.
3	....	4	....	1	0	—
4	....	5	....	1	3	—
5	....	6	....	1	6	—
6	....	7	....	1	9	—
7	....	8	....	2	0	—

with from 12½ to 20 per cent. discount on the above charges for payment from the landlord.

Mr. Hawksley continues,—"I believe I may claim for myself an experience in the construction and management of works on the system of "constant supply" as extensive as that possessed by any other engineer. Amongst numerous other advantageous results of the application of that system has been the discovery of the important fact that, with properly constructed works, a "constant supply" can be afforded with less cost and less wear and tear than an "intermittent supply."

The Woods and Forests.—In reply to a question by Lord Duncan in the Commons, Lord John Russell has intimated that it is the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill this session to make better provision for the management of the woods, forests, and land revenues of the Crown, and for the direction of public works and buildings.

Statue of Wallace.—This colossal work by Mr. Patrick Park is now completed, and has been removed for exhibition to a wooden building at Bellevue, Edinburgh. On Thursday week the uncovering of the statue took place in presence of a large party of Mr. Park's friends.

For more information on OCR and PDF Compression go to our website